REMARKS

The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated 18 January 2006. Claims 1, 2, 4 to 12, 14 to 18, 32 to 37, 39 to 47, 49 to 53, 67 to 71, 74 and 119 to 121 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 32, 36, 67, 71 and 74 are independent.

Claims 1, 32, 36, 67, 71 and 74 were objected to for informalities. Amendments to the claims are believed to obviate the objections. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 32, 36, 67, 71 and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action contends that features of "the items are displayed without accessing the resources," "the further items are displayed without accessing the resources," "the table of contents items are displayed without accessing the resources," and "index items are displayed without accessing the resources" lack support in the specification. The rejections are respectfully traversed, since the features are clearly described in the specification.

One example of clear support for the foregoing features can be found at page 100, lines 10 to 16, of the specification, which describes that "The Media Browsing System differs from existing HTML browsers in that the entities mediating the browsing [eg., the (DDF) descriptions] contain only descriptions of the resources to be browsed. In the case of the HTML browser, the HTML documents represent the resource, control the presentation of the resource and also contain some description of the resource (the META tag). The browser typically does not use the descriptive information. In contrast, the entities mediating the browsing in the Media Browser System are ONLY descriptions of

resources." Therefore, the foregoing features are believed to be supported by the specification. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 9, 11, 12, 14 to 18, 32, 33, 35 to 37, 39 to 44, 47, 49 to 53, 67, 68, 70, 71, 74 and 119 to 121 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,644,776 (DeRose), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over DeRose . Claims 10 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over DeRose in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,148 (Rowe). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The present invention concerns a method of browsing electronically-accessible resources using descriptions of the resources. The descriptions are separate from the resources. The invention displays items for selection by a user, the items being displayed without a need to access the resource itself. This feature is particularly useful in the case of large electronically-accessible resources, as the invention avoids the time and effort wasted in downloading resources which ultimately are not required by the user.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 defines a method of browsing electronically-accessible resources using descriptions of the resources. The method comprises reading the descriptions of the resources without reading the resources, the descriptions being separate from the resources and having descriptor components having attributes representative of at least two axes of access to the resources. At least one of the axes of access being a table-of-contents classification, each descriptor component having an attribute representative of the table-of-contents classification also having a link to a corresponding portion of the electronically-accessible resources. The method also comprises displaying items for selection in accordance with an attribute representative of a

first axis of access that is the table-of-contents classification, without accessing the resources, each item being associated with a corresponding descriptor component of a description read in the reading step. The method also comprises receiving a selection of one or more descriptor components using the displayed items, receiving an indication of a further axis of access, and displaying, in response to the received indication, further items for selection in accordance with an attribute representative of the further axis of access, without accessing the resources. The further items correspond to child descriptor components of the selected one or more descriptor components. The method also comprises reading, in response to a further selection of a descriptor component having an attribute representative of the table-of-contents classification, a portion of the electronically-accessible resources via the link of the selected descriptor component.

In entering the rejections, the Office Action asserts that DeRose discloses "the table of contents that contains elements for displaying is constructed by traversing the document tree." The Office Action further asserts "with this table of contents, an element having a tile [sic, title] is displayed. As seen, the elements as *items* of table of contents are read and displayed from the constructed table of content records that is built by traversing the document tree and element directory data structure. Thus, *the items are displayed without accessing the resources*." Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Contrary to the Office Action's assertion, DeRose discloses that "The rendering of the text for the table of contents may be performed in the same manner as a document." (column 17, lines 12 to 14 of DeRose). More specifically, DeRose discloses that the displayed table of contents is merely a different view of the same document. (column 17, lines 19 to 26, referring to Figure 14, which shows different views of the same

document, one of the views being a table of contents). The different views of the same document are rendered using style sheets, such a style sheet for the table of contents, that are for "displaying formatted text of a document on an output device." (column 16, lines 1 to 2).

Accordingly, when the system of DeRose is displaying a particular view of a document, whether the whole document or a table of contents, the items for display are retrieved from the original document. While an element directory may arguably be used as a tool to retrieve an item from the actual document in order to display to the user, display of a table of contents in DeRose is seen to involve accessing the actual document. For example, DeRose discloses at column 18, lines 33 to 43 that the first step of the rendering pre-function is the step of determining whether the element is a text chunk. DeRose discloses that this step may be accomplished by examining the type name field 102 for the current element. If the element is a text chunk, the text is retrieved from the text file and sent to the output device, formatted according to the style settings provided at the top of a style stack. Accordingly, the rendering of text chunks in the method of DeRose is seen to further teach that DeRose's display of a table of contents requires access to the resource.

The remaining references, namely Rowe, are not seen to supply what is missing from DeRose. Accordingly, independent Claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Independent Claims 36 and 71 are directed to an apparatus and computer readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 36 and 71 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Claim 32 is directed to a method of annotating an electronically-accessible resource using a description of the resource. The method comprises reading the description of the resource without reading the resource, the description being separate from the resource and having descriptor components each of which comprises a name of a feature of the resource and an associated representative value for the feature, the description also having one or more of the descriptor components including a table of contents attribute and one or more of the descriptor components including an index attribute, the descriptor components that include a table of contents attribute also having a link to a corresponding portion of the resource. The method also comprises displaying one or more tables of contents containing table of contents items, without accessing the resources, each table of contents item being associated with a corresponding descriptor component that has a table of contents attribute, and receiving a selection of one displayed table of contents item for an annotation. The method also comprises displaying an index containing displayed index items without accessing the resources, each displayed index item being associated with a corresponding descriptor component that has an index attribute and is associated with the selected table of contents item. The method also comprises receiving a selection of one displayed index item, associating the selected displayed index item with the selected table of contents item, receiving a choice of a representative value for the selected displayed index item, and associating the chosen representative value with the feature which corresponds to the selected displayed index item, wherein the chosen representative value and its corresponding feature provide the annotation of the resource.

Independent Claim 32 includes, for example, the features of displaying one or more tables of contents without accessing the resources and displaying an index

containing displayed index items without accessing the resources. As discussed above in regard to Claim 1, displaying of items without accessing the underlying resource is neither disclosed nor suggested by DeRose. In light of the deficiencies of DeRose as discussed above, independent Claim 32 is believed to be allowable.

Independent Claims 67 and 74 are directed to an apparatus and computer readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 32. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 67 and 74 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the allowability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 112429v1